

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-------------------------|---------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 09/676,162 | 09/29/2000 | Lee B. Hansen | RA 5311 | 9340 |
| 27516 75 | 90 02/02/2005 | | EXAMINER | |
| UNISYS CORPORATION | | | LIPMAN, JACOB | |
| MS 4773 PO BOX 64942 | | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
| ST. PAUL, MN 55164-0942 | | | 2134 | |

DATE MAILED: 02/02/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

| | Application No. | Applicant(s) | | | |
|---|--|--|---|--|--|
| | | | • | | |
| Advisory Action | 09/676,162 | HANSEN ET AL. | | | |
| | Examiner | Art Unit | | | |
| The MAIL INC DATE of this a manufaction one | Jacob Lipman | 2134 | | | |
| The MAILING DATE of this c mmunication appe | , | • | | | |
| THE REPLY FILED 11 January 2005 FAILS TO PLACE Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to average final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1 condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appea Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. | void abandonment of this applica) a timely filed amendment whicl | ation. A proper repl h places the applica | y to a Ition in | | |
| PERIOD FOR RE | EPLY [check either a) or b)] | | | | |
| a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing | - | | | | |
| b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this in no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Offitimely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 C | later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF The date on which the petition under 37 CF of extension and the corresponding amounthe shortened statutory period for reply cellater than three months after the mai | g date of the final rejecting FINAL REJECTION. R 1.136(a) and the approper of the fee. The appropriationally set in the final | on. See MPEP opriate extension ropriate extension Office action; or | | |
| 1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFI | | | | | |
| 2.⊠ The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be | • | | | | |
| (a) X they raise new issues that would require further | er consideration and/or search (| see NOTE below); | | | |
| (b) ⊠ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note b | | ,. | | | |
| (c) ☐ they are not deemed to place the application i issues for appeal; and/or | · · | rially reducing or si | mplifying the | | |
| (d) they present additional claims without cancel | ing a corresponding number of f | inally rejected claim | is. | | |
| NOTE: See Continuation Sheet. | | • | | | |
| 3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): | | | | | |
| 4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s). | be allowable if submitted in a se | eparate, timely filed | amendment | | |
| 5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request for application in condition for allowance because: | | idered but does NO | T place the | | |
| 6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered bed raised by the Examiner in the final rejection. | ause it is not directed SOLELY | to issues which wer | e newly | | |
| 7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims w | · · · · — | | and an | | |
| The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: | | | | | |
| Claim(s) allowed: | | | | | |
| Claim(s) objected to: | | | | | |
| Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-40</u> . | • | | | | |
| Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: 41-52. | | | | | |
| 8. The drawing correction filed on is a) app | roved or b) disapproved by t | he Examiner. | | | |
| 9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s) | | | | | |
| 10. Other: | | | | | |
| | | | | | |

Continuation of 2. NOTE: Changing "performance level" in claim 1 to "processing performance level" changes the scope of the claim, as do the amendments to claims 38 and 40, and would require further search. The amended phrase "without having to reboot" adds new matter.

GREGORY MORSE SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100